

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/811,558	03/29/2004	Geun-soo Lee	29925/39912	1407	
4743 75	90 06/08/2006		EXAMINER		
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP			LEE, SIN J		
233 S. WACKE SEARS TOWE	ER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 R		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL			1752		
			DATE MAIL ED. 06/09/200	DATE MAIL ED. 04/09/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	<i>-</i> [
	Application No.		~
Office Action Summany	10/811,558	LEE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sin J. Lee	1752	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence addres	s
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 (after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNI CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO y statute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this commur BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	27 March 2006.		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for a	llowance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the me	rits is
closed in accordance with the practice ur	nder <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the applic			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 13-16</u> is/are allowed.	ingrawn from consideration.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7-0 and 75-70</u> Israre allowed.			
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11 and 12</u> is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2004 is/		ected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	correction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by t	the Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-1	52.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	oreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
 Certified copies of the priority docu 	ıments have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docu		• •	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		n received in this National Stag	ge
application from the International E	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	t received	
* See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies no	rreceived.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)	
2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9	48) Paper No	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152	١
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/ Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	SB/08) 5) \(\bigcap \text{Notice of } \) Other:		,

Application/Control Number: 10/811,558 Page 2

Art Unit: 1752

DETAILED ACTION

1. No amendment was filed with RCE filed on March 27, 2006, and thus the same rejections as addressed in the last office action mailed on March 10, 2006 are being repeated below, and the following rejections are made non-final.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 11 and 12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 11 uses the transitional phrase "comprises" whereas present clam 7, from which claim 11 depends, has been narrowed to recited "consisting essentially of", and thus claims 11 and 12 fail to further limit the subject matter of claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 4. Claims 7, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mitchell et al (US 6,590,137 B2).

Mitchell teaches (claim 1) a multicomponent superabsorbent particle comprising at least one basic water-absorbing resin in contact with at least one acidic water-absorbing resin. As one the examples for the acidic water-absorbing resin, Mitchell teaches (claim 19) a *polyvinylphosphonic acid*. Mitchell also teaches (col.17, lines 21-28, lines 36-40) multicomponent superabsorbent particles having microdomains of the

Application/Control Number: 10/811,558

Art Unit: 1752

acidic resin and the basic resin dispersed in a continuous phase of a matrix resin, and as one of examples for the matrix resin, Mitchell teaches polyvinyl alcohol. Based on Mitchell's teaching, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to form multicomponent superabsorbent particles having microdomains of polyvinylphosphonic acid (as the acidic water-absorbing resin) and the basic water-absorbing resin dispersed in a continuous phase of polyvinyl alcohol (as a matrix resin) with a reasonable expectation of obtaining superabsorbent particles that exhibit exceptional water absorption. Also, Mitchell teaches polyvinylamine as one of examples for his basic resin (claim 15). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use polyvinylamine as Mitchell's basic water-absorbing resin with a reasonable expectation of obtaining superabsorbent particles that exhibit exceptional water absorption. Mitchell's composition containing polyvinylphosphonic acid (as his acidic waterabsorbing resin), polyvinyl alcohol (as his matrix resin) and polyvinylamine (as his basic resin) would render obvious present inventions of claims 7, 11, and 12: It is the Examiner's position that Mitchell's polyvinylamine would not materially affect the characteristics of present composition of claim 7 because applicants are also claiming an amine compound in present claims 11 and 12. Also, it is the Examiner's position that Mitchell's particles comprising polyvinylphosphonic acid, polyvinyl alcohol and polyvinylamine would inherently be capable of being used as an organic anti-reflective coating composition.

5. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mougin (6,159,457).

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/811,558

Art Unit: 1752

In claim 2, Mougin teaches the following:

2. A method for coating keratinous substances, said method comprising:

coating said keratinous substance with a cosmetic or dermatological composition comprising an aqueous solution or an aqueous dispersion containing:

- (a) at least one non-crosslinked polymer capable of forming, after is drying, a deposit or a film on said keratinous substances, said polymer exhibiting a critical temperature Te for solubility in water of the LCST or UCST type ranging from 0° to 100° C.; and
- (b) at least one surfactant and/or at least one hydrophilic polymer, said at least one surfactant and said at least one hydrophilic polymer not exhibiting a critical temperature Tc of the LCST or UCST type ranging from 0° to 100° C.,

wherein said at least one surfactant and/or said at least one hydrophilic polymer is capable of establishing a physical interaction with said at least one non-crosslinked polymer.

As example for the "at least one hydrophilic polymer", Mougin includes polyvinyl alcohol and polyvinylphosphonic acid polymer (see col.5, lines 13-35). Since Mougin teaches that there can be at least one hydrophilic polymer, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use both polyvinyl alcohol and polyvinylphosphonic acid as the hydrophilic polymers in Mougin's composition with a reasonable expectation of obtaining a film exhibiting satisfactory mechanical and cosmetic properties which do not change in the envisaged cosmetic application. Also, as one of the examples for the non-crosslinked polymer, Mougin discloses polyvinyl alcohol (see col.4, lines 17-20, lines 39-40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use polyvinyl alcohol as Mougin's non-crosslinked polymer with a reasonable expectation of obtaining a film exhibiting satisfactory mechanical and cosmetic properties which do not change in the envisaged cosmetic application. Mougin also teaches (col.5, lines 36-41) that those hydrophilic polymers are present in the composition in the preferred amount of 10-30% by weight. Assuming one uses the polyvinyl alcohol and polyvinylphosphonic acid in

Art Unit: 1752

equal amount, this will give 5-15% by weight for each polymer. Mougin also teaches amine salts and ammonium salts as some of examples of the surfactant to be used in his composition discussed above (see col.5, lines 52-61). Thus, *Mougin's composition containing polyvinyl alcohol (as Mougin's non-crosslinked polymer), polyvinyl alcohol and polyvinylphosphonic acid polymer (as Mougin's hydrophilic polymer), and amine salts (as Mougin's surfactant)* renders obvious present inventions of claims 7-12. It is the Examiner's position that Mougin's amine salts would not materially affect the characteristics of present composition of claim 7 because applicants are also claiming an amine compound in present claims 11 and 12. It is also the Examiner's position that Mougin's composition comprising polyvinylphosphonic acid, polyvinyl alcohol and amine salts would inherently be capable of being used as an organic anti-reflective coating composition.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-6 and 13-16 are allowed. None of the cited prior arts teaches or suggests present method of forming a pattern as claimed in present claim 1 or claim 13.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants argue that Mitchell's composition and Mougin's composition must contain additional materials required for the intended uses and that those additional materials would materially affect the characteristics of the present coating composition.

However, even if those additional materials mentioned in Mitchell and Mougin were to materially affect the characteristics of present coating composition, those additional materials *are not required materials* in those references. The only

Art Unit: 1752

constitutional elements in Mitchell's particle composition are basic water-absorbing resin, acidic water absorbing resin and a matrix resin. As already discussed above, polyvinylamine, which is disclosed as one of examples for Mitchell's basic resin, would not materially affect the characteristics of present coating composition because applicants themselves are claiming an amine compound in claims 11 and 12. Also, Mougin specifically states that his invention can (not "must") contain adjuvants usually found in the cosmetic and dermatological fields (col.7, lies 61-63). Therefore, it is still the Examiner's position that Mitchell's composition containing polyvinylphosphonic acid (as his acidic water-absorbing resin), polyvinyl alcohol (as his matrix resin) and polyvinylamine (as his basic resin) would render obvious present inventions of claims 7, 11, and 12 and that Mitchell's particles comprising polyvinylphosphonic acid, polyvinyl alcohol and polyvinylamine would inherently be capable of being used as an organic anti-reflective coating composition. Also, it is still the Examiner's position that Mougin's composition containing polyvinyl alcohol (as Mougin's non-crosslinked polymer), polyvinyl alcohol and polyvinylphosphonic acid polymer (as Mougin's hydrophilic polymer), and amine salts (as Mougin's surfactant) renders obvious present inventions of claims 7-12 and that Mougin's composition comprising polyvinylphosphonic acid, polyvinyl alcohol and amine salts would inherently be capable of being used as an organic anti-reflective coating composition.

For the reasons stated above, present rejections over Mitchell and Mougin still stand.

Application/Control Number: 10/811,558 Page 7

Art Unit: 1752

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sin J. Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-1333. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 am EST to 5:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly, can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. J. L.

S. Lee June 6, 2006

SIN LEE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Sir J. Lee